

REMARKS

Claims 7-22 are pending in the present application and at issue.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment presents no new issues or new matter and places this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is requested.

I. The Rejection of Claims 7-9, 11-12, and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 7-9, 11-12, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blackburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,762,948) in view of Johansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,585). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Blackburn et al. disclose fabric wipes comprising a disinfectant formulation comprising a bacteriocin, a chelating agent, a stabilizer for the bacteriocin, a surfactant, a salt, a skin conditioner or humectant, and an agent to promote rapid drying. Blackburn et al. further disclose that the bacteriocin may be lysostaphin. In addition, Blackburn et al. disclose that the disinfectant formulation may be used for disinfecting and drying (1) a cow teat prior to or after milking, (2) a skin surface, and (3) a food contact surface.

However, Blackburn et al. do not teach or suggest methods of washing a fabric using a lysostaphin, as claimed herein.

Moreover, Applicants have discovered that malodor of fabrics is caused by the presence of *Staphylococcus* species such as *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, *S. intermedius*, *S. saprophyticus* and *S. hyicus*. In the specification, Applicants have demonstrated that lysostaphins are able to significantly reduce malodor of fabrics. These results are surprising and unexpected.

Johansen discloses methods of killing or inhibiting the growth of microbial cells present on laundry, comprising contacting the cells with a compositions a polycationic compound and one or more enzymes.

However, Johansen do not teach or suggest methods of washing a fabric using a lysostaphin, as claimed herein. Moreover, Johansen also do not teach or suggest that malodor is caused by the presence of *Staphylococcus* species such as *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*, *S. intermedius*, *S. saprophyticus* and *S. hyicus*, or that lysostaphins are capable of reducing malodor.

The Office Action stated the following:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to wash a fabric with a detergent composition comprising an

enzyme having lysostaphin activity, a surfactant, and the specific enzymes recited by the instant claims, because Johansen et al. teach a detergent composition comprising an enzyme derived from the *Staphylococcus epidermidis* which is known in the art to produce lysostaphin enzyme and the other requisite components as recited by the instant claims and furthermore, Blackburn et al. teach a method of disinfection of surfaces in general with a bacteriocin based formulation comprising lysostaphin, a chelating agent, a salt, a stabilizer and a surfactant.

This is respectfully traversed.

Johansen does not disclose an enzyme derived from *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, as alleged in the Office Action. Instead, *Staphylococcus epidermidis* is used as the test organism for demonstrating the bacteriocidal activity of an enzyme. Moreover, the Office is incorrect that *Staphylococcus epidermidis* is known in the art to produce lysostaphin.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early action to that end is respectfully requested. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this amendment or application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2004


Elias J. Lampris, Reg. No. 33,728
Novozymes North America, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10110
(212) 840-0097